

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants : W. Daniel Hillis, et al.
Application No. : 10/734,647
Confirmation No. : 9050
Filed : December 11, 2003
TITLE : RECEPTION OF SPATIAL-TO-TEMPORAL
TRANSLATED DATA

Examiner : Savla, Arpan P.
Art Unit : 2185
Docket No. : SE1-0002-US
(formerly 0803-003-005A-000000)
Customer No. : 80118

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

AMENDMENT IN RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION
DATED MARCH 5, 2009

Sir:

This paper is responsive to the Office Action dated March 5, 2009, having a shortened statutory period expiring June 5, 2008. Applicant hereby petitions for a three-month extension of time for response to September 5, 2009. Further examination and reconsideration are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks set forth below.

Interview Summary begins on page 2.

Amendments to the Specification begin on page 4.

Amendments to the claims begin on page 5.

Remarks begin on page 15.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

A telephone interview was held between Examiner Arpan Savla and Mark Hennings, Attorney for Applicant, on August 27, 2009 to consider and discuss the §101 and §103 rejections to the claims with claims 1, 6, and 7 being representative. On behalf of Applicant, the undersigned representative expresses gratitude to the Examiner for his courtesy and open-mindedness during the subject interview.

With respect to the §101 rejections, it is believed that a tentative agreement was reached with the Examiner that limiting claim 1, for example, to a hardware spatial data storage system would overcome the rejections. Applicant's attorney stated he reserved the right to argue that the specification disclosed all-software embodiments executing on electronic circuitry.

With respect to the §102/103 rejections, it is believed that a tentative agreement was reached with the Examiner that the proposed amendment to claim 7 of Applicant's independent claims as contained in this Response will overcome the Examiner's current rejections based on Jaeger in view of IEEE as applied above, and further in view of Yao et al. However, the Examiner will need to conduct an additional search prior to expressing an opinion on the overall allowability of the proposed amended claims.

Applicant respectfully continues to assert or maintain its position regarding any and all claims discussed during the interview, contests any assertion(s) made by the Examiner during the interview or in the Examiner's Interview Summary (unless otherwise stated in writing), and hereby reserves the right to address such assertions or any other issues related to the present application in this or any subsequent form. Similarly, the fact that any rejections and/or statements made by the Examiner during the interview, or in the Examiner's subsequent Interview Summary, may not be explicitly addressed by Applicant herein or during the interview

should NOT be taken as an admission of any sort, and Applicant hereby reserves any and all rights to contest such rejections and/or statements at a later time. Specifically, no waiver (legal, factual, or otherwise), implicit or explicit, is hereby intended (e.g., with respect to any facts of which Examiner took Official Notice, and/or for which Examiner has supplied no objective showing, Applicant hereby contest those facts and requests express documentary proof of such facts at such time at which such facts may become relevant). Although not expressly set forth herein, Applicant continues to assert all points of (e.g., caused by, resulting from, responsive to, etc.) any previous Office Action, and no waiver (legal, factual, or otherwise) implicit or explicit, is hereby intended.